

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed March 04, 2008, submitted concurrently with a three month extension of time to extend the due date for response to September 4, 2008.

By this Amendment, claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 have been amended to more particularly define the present invention and to address the objection and rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Further, claim 10 has been amended in preparation of possible rejoinder of the claim upon the allowance of the elected claims. Thus, in view of the amendments to the claims, claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to its underlying subject matter. Thus, claims 1-5 and 7-10 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1-3, 9 and 10 being withdrawn. Support for the claim amendments can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims, see, in particular, page 8, line 2, and page 9, line 8, of the specification.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Request for Rejoinder

Applicant hereby formally requests rejoinder of non-elected claim 10 upon the allowance of the elected claims since this claim is directed to related subject matter and contains identical claim elements (for example, aromatic hydrocarbon) as the elected claims.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 5 is objected to for a minor informality. Applicant has amended claim 5 as per the Examiner's suggestion. Thus, in view of the amendment to claim 5, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has reviewed and amended the claims to address each concern raised by the

Examiner on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Thus, in view of these amendments to the claims, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Boccu et al. (1970 Eur. J. Biochem 13: 188-192). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To constitute anticipation of the claimed invention under U.S. practice, the prior art reference must literally or inherently teach each and every limitation of the claims. Here, in this case, Boccu et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims with particular emphasis on the limitations “*separating a peptide containing an amino acid residue modified with an aromatic hydrocarbon group, by using a media comprising an aromatic hydrocarbon group*”, and “*exposing the fragmented sample solution to a media comprising an aromatic hydrocarbon group, to separate the peptide fragment containing the amino acid residue modified with the aromatic hydrocarbongroup from the peptide fragment with no amino acid residue modified with the aromatic hydrocarbongroup*”.

Boccu et al. teaches a method for the separation and purification of a protein/peptide using a sephadex column which only contains π electron. However, Boccu et al. does not at all teach or suggest a column comprising a media with an aromatic hydrocarbon group and taking advantage of the π - π electron interaction between the aromatic hydrocarbon group of the media and the aromatic hydrocarbon group of the peptide to assist in the enrichment/separation of the peptide.

Thus, for these reasons, withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: September 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

CHENG LAW GROUP PLLC

1100 17th Street, N.W.

Suite 503

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 530-1280

Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4422 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.